

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/802,549 03/16/2004		Eitan Cadouri	524322000600	3719	
56702	7590 01/31/2006	EXAMINER			
	IONS c/o MOFO SF	DANG, PHUC T			
425 MARKET STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2818		
			DATE MAILED: 01/31/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Applicatio	n No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/802,54	9	CADOURI, EITAN				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		PHUC T. D	ANG	2818				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on ame	endment filed	December 12, 2005.					
· —	•	s action is no						
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
4) 🖂	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15 and 21-25</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)🖂	5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>12-15 and 21-25</u> is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 8</u> is/are rejected.							
7) 🖂	Claim(s) <u>2-7 and 9-11</u> is/are objected to.							
8) 🗌								
Application	on Papers							
9) 🗀 7	The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>16 March 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:								
	 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachment	(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)								
3) 🔲 Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 · No(s)/Mail Date	3)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		O-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on December 12, 2005 have been fully considered but that are not persuasive and Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 and 21-25 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1, 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Subramanian (U.S. Patent No. 6,756,796 B2).

Regarding claim 1, Subramanian discloses an improved method for identifying the reference die on a wafer comprising:

a) providing a die placement of die to be formed on the wafer [Figs. 1-2]. b) obtaining one or more locations on the wafer contacted by one or mere processing structures or a substance

Art Unit: 2818

emitted by one or more processing structures (read and store the die locations based on the wafer is rotated).

c) adjusting the die placement based on the obtained one or more locations on the wafer (wafer movement) [Figs. 4-20d].

Regarding claim 5, Subramanian discloses adjusting the one or more locations on the wafer based on thee die placement, wherein the die placement and the one or more locations on the wafer are adjusted together [Figs. 4-11].

Regarding claim 8, Subramanian discloses the die placement includes an arrangement of the reticle array (matrix), wherein each reticle array includes an arrangement of dice [Fig. 4].

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 12-15 and 21-25 would be allowed.

The following is a statement of reason for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claims 12-15 and 21-25 are considered allowable since the prior art of record and the considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure does not teach or suggest the claimed invention having one or more locations on the wafer contacted by one or more clamps as disclosed in claim 12 and adjusting the die placement based on the obtained one or more locations on the wafer, wherein the adjusted die placement produce a higher yield of dice formed on the wafer than the die placement obtained in step a) as disclosed in claim 21.

Claims 2-4, 6-7 and 9-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2818

None of the Prior art of record does not disclose the die placement is adjusted to increase yield of the dice formed on the wafer as cited in claim 2 and the die placement and one or more locations on the wafer are adjusted to increase yield of the die formed on the wafer as cited in claim 6 and the one or more processing structures include a clamp to hold the wafer during a fabrication process as cited in claim 9 and the one or more processing structures include a jet that emits a chemical solution or water at the wafer as cited in claim 10 and the dice are formed on a first surface on the wafer, and wherein the one or more locations are on the first surface of the wafer or on a second surface on the wafer opposite the first surface as cited in claim 11.

Claims 3-4 and 7 are directly or indirectly depend on claims 2 and 6, then, they also would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

- 4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuc T. Dang whose telephone number is 571-272-1776. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am-5:00 pm.
- 5. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David C. Nelms can be reached on (571) 272-1787. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and Final communications.
- 6. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Langgomer

Art Unit: 2818

Phuc T. Dang

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2818